



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/534,877

05/12/2005

Armin Schwerdtner

356907.00002-US

6555

78905

7590

12/12/2008

Saul Ewing LLP (Philadelphia)

Attn: Patent Docket Clerk

2 North Second St.

Harrisburg, PA 17101

EXAMINER

CHANG, AUDREY Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/534,877	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHWERDTNER, ARMIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Audrey Y. Chang	<b>Art Unit</b> 2872	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Audrey Y. Chang. (3) Ralf Haussler.

(2) Stephone Allen. (4) Mark Simpson.

Date of Interview: 24 November 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: A working model of stereoscopic image display utilizing video hologram.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: 7,053,925.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: An off-site interview was conducted on November 24, 2008, with a group of examiners in AU 2872 visited law office of Saul Ewing LLP. The applicant demonstrated a working model of the stereoscopic image display using computer generated video hologram. The applicant also pointed out the differences of the calculation methods between the instant application and prior art for the computer generated hologram.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Audrey Y. Chang/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2872	
--	--